



CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL BELIEF CLIMATE

Asst. Prof. Mustafa ASLAN

Istanbul Gelisim University, Faculty of Economics, Administration and Social Sciences, Istanbul/TURKEY
ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8049-3615>



ABSTRACT

Although it has been affecting our business, social and private lives from the day we started to walk on the earth's surface, organizational belief climate, as defined in this study, is a brand new concept and variable. An organization understands, interprets, and reacts to the environment, events, stakeholders, and other organizations based on the beliefs possessed by the organization and tries to shape them accordingly. This study attempts to elaborate on this concept's differences from and interactions with similar concepts and to establish its theoretical framework in this respect. It indeed will have some shortcomings, errors, and limitations because there is no comparable study in the literature, and in general, belief is only perceived from a religious point of view, whereas the organizational belief climate has a completely different definition. However, it is considered to be important for being a starting point for similar studies and forming a basis for future studies.

Keywords: Belief, Organizational Belief Climate, Organizational Spirituality, Workplace

1. INTRODUCTION

Belief is a concept that profoundly influences, shapes, and directs people's value judgments, hence their business and private lives. Although belief is confused with many different concepts such as religion and faith and is often used interchangeably, it is a distinct and even separate concept from both religion and faith.

Religion (*Din* in Turkish) means *judgment, binding rules, obligation* according to its lexical meaning. In general, religion refers to a composition of rules established by one or more creators, whereby the creator(s) allegedly send(s) his/their rules to people, including messages as to how to live, what to do, and what to refrain from, as well as social rules, via humans (prophet, saints) and/or other creatures (angels, sons or daughters of God), and it is shaped on the grounds of these messages and involves certain rituals. In other words, religion is an organized structure based on the idea that God communicates his judgments through his messengers in order for people to comply with them, and people should live, have faith, and regulate their relationships pursuant to these judgments. In this respect, religion is a formal and structured system of rules, including reward and punishment associated with a certain cause-effect relation.

Belief, unlike religion, is a set of unstructured, unrestricted acknowledgments that are not bound by any rules or laws, whether scientific, social, or formal. In this respect, belief does not require a person to accept a creator's existence or be a member of a religion. Not accepting the presence of a creator is also a belief. Devotion to any ideology is a belief, as well.

Reducing the concept of belief to *religion or having faith in the existence of a creator* is merely a judgment we make from our point of view and the act of labeling based on such judgment.

This theoretical study aims to describe the concepts of belief, religion, and faith, analyze the concept of organizational belief climate in the literature, and make the ideal definition.

2. TERMS USED IN THE SAME MEANING AS BELIEF

Many terms are used in the same meaning as belief in daily language and sometimes even in literature. It would be challenging to establish what the concept of belief is or is not without examining the other concepts used simultaneously and their differences from belief. Therefore, it is necessary to define these concepts and establish why they differ from belief.

2.1. Religion

The Turkish Religious Foundation (TDV) Encyclopedia of Islam defines the term *Din* (religion) as “judgment...” in the Aramaic-Hebrew language (Tümer, 1994:312). Gaudefroy-Demombynes (1969:504), on the other hand, suggests that the word *din* (religion) is the modified form of the word *deyn*, which means *debt, obligation*. The same is true for the English word religion derived from the Latin word *Religare*, which means *to bind*, and *religious* means the person who observes the laws (Hoyt, 1912). Indeed we can fully describe the concept of religion by using both of them together. Religion refers to *the obligations that God imposes on people through the judgments he sent through his prophets*. Thus, religion regulates people’s relationships with themselves, society, their families, nature, and the creator and affects their beliefs. However, such a part can be called *religious belief*, which may amount to a very small portion of people’s beliefs. This is because people’s beliefs are based not only on religion but also on many factors, including the society they live in, the family they grow up in, their circle of friends, education, ideologies, and living standards.

However, all religious systems, institutions, and clergypersons have always tried to interpret belief only on the basis of *religious beliefs* and dictate religious beliefs to the work-life (Carroll, 2013). This is because religious identity is an essential concept for both individuals and society, and people always want to establish the basis of their beliefs. The importance of religious identity is also reflected in the statistics. Indeed, religious identity is essential for 60% of Americans, about 30% of British and Canadian people (Estreicher & Gray, 2006), and for about 44.6% of people living in Turkey (Çarkoğlu & Toprak, 2006).

Suppose their beliefs contradict the claims of their religion in these efforts to establish the basis of their beliefs. In that case, people usually prefer their beliefs based on their own experience, understanding, and reasoning rather than religion. For example, almost all religions include slavery, but today you cannot find anyone who believes in and advocates slavery. Unless, of course, we argue that the institution of slavery has changed form and that the current system is also a kind of slavery.

You cannot find any Christian or Jewish astronomer, physicist, or scientist who believes that the world was created in six days, but their religion says it was. In other words, their beliefs are not based on religion. Women’s rights and interaction with women can also be considered in this context. Likewise, the forms of government or the laws that regulate societies can also be considered in this respect. Religious rules govern no country in the world; even in countries that claim to be governed by religious rules, laws are made in line with the beliefs of lawmakers and do not constitute religion even if they are claimed to be originated thereof. For example, while Islam acknowledges that the source of religion, i.e., the judgment, is the Quran (Surah As-Saffat 154-157, Surah Al-Qalam 36.37, and Surah Al-Ma’idah 49), the reason why there are different practices, different sects suggest different judgments, and almost every congregation and religious order follows its own way, is not God’s grace to his creatures. This is because the judgments reflect the rule maker’s culture, level of knowledge, level of awareness, perspective, perception of life, and other factors, and all those factors are shaped by and shape the rule maker’s beliefs to a certain extend.

2.2. Faith

In Turkish *iman* (“faith”), meaning “to confirm something with a sense of trust, to believe,” is derived from the root *emn* (*emân*), which means “to feel safe, to be fearless” (Sinanoğlu, 1994). Although Ok (2007) says that the term *iman* should be translated as “belief,” the English equivalent of the term *iman* is faith, as stated by many other researchers. The difference is evident considering the sentences “I have faith in God” (implying a sense of trust in God) and “I believe in God,” or “I have faith in you” and “I believe in you.” Although their meanings are so different, these two concepts are often used interchangeably. This is because the foreign words taken into the other language are used in a way that is detached from their original meanings, and then people mistakenly think that this meaning is universal. For example, the word *ceza* (“punishment”) is used in Turkish to mean “upsetting, troublesome, or painful action or sanction applied to those who act inappropriately” (definition of Turkish Language Association), namely in the sense of “punishment” in English, while its original meaning is a consideration, price. *Ceza* means “*the price and consideration of something*” and, as an infinitive, “*to give/pay full and sufficient consideration/price in return for a good or a bad action or behavior*” (Bebek, 1994). In other words, the reward received by a person for a good deed she/he does, as well as the sanction imposed thereon for a bad thing she/he does, is a *ceza*.

That is to say, faith is a confirmation of something wholeheartedly and with trust, while there is no such obligation for belief. If we return to the previous example, to have faith in God means *to confirm the existence*

of God wholeheartedly and without any doubt, while to believe in God means to think or assume that God exists.

In this respect, belief and faith are different concepts.

2.3. Spirituality

According to the definition given by the Oxford Languages provider, spiritual means “not material; internal; related to one’s inner world”. In other words, spirituality is “one’s effort to understand and acknowledge the relationship with oneself and other people, one’s place in the universe, and the meaning of life” (Boztilki & Ardic, 2017:40). It is to understand and attribute meaning to people’s experiences and reason of existence and determine the past and future and the purpose of life. In this regard, spirituality is entirely an understanding of one’s own self and their place in the universe. According to Hull (1990:51, as cited in Ok, 2017), “anything that takes a person above or beyond his/her biological existence and impulses can be described as spiritual.” In this sense, it is possible to speak of “the spirituality of...art, music, science, and even money” (Ok, 2017:40).

Although spirituality, like religion, shapes certain beliefs, these beliefs are about one’s existence, self, and place in the universe. Hence, belief and spirituality are different concepts.

2.4. Ideology

According to Ergil (2015:70), ideology consists of “beliefs, thoughts, and attitudes that are closely related to each other and are specific to a group or circle.” Therefore, ideology is a broader concept which includes beliefs as well. A similar definition has been made by Gürbüz (2018:1) as “ready-to-use, dogmatic, social belief contents that contain indisputable and absolute acceptances about existence, life, things, and events...” In other words, ideology is formed by certain beliefs that come together, but it should be noted here that people who advocate the same ideology do not have to share the same beliefs. Nor have they to be at the same level in the beliefs they share.

A joke about the USSR actually depicts the whole situation (D’encausse, 2019:11): The USSR leaders are on a train that brakes down and stops. Lenin, the father of the revolution, shouts “Shot the machinist!” When it is Stalin’s turn, “All the travelers to the Gulag¹!” he orders. Khrushchev, on the other hand, thinks he can move the train by rehabilitating everyone. Finally, it’s Brezhnev’s turn. He calmly says: “Close the curtains so nobody can see that the train stopped.”

When people who advocate the same ideology have different attitudes against the same situation, it means that their decision is actually affected by their beliefs, not ideology. In other words, just like in the concept of religion, it is neither their religions nor their ideologies that affect people’s decisions. It is their beliefs.

Therefore, it is not correct to use the concept of ideology in the same sense as the concept of belief. When one’s belief is based on ideology, the term “ideological belief” can be used, as the case in religious belief.

2.5. Value

Value is “an abstract, generalized principle of behavior in which the members of a group feel a positive and strong emotional commitment and which provides a standard to judge behaviors and goals. Values are considered not only as explicit statements confirmed by each group member but also as the individual commitment of each member who internalizes them in the socialization process.” (Theodorson & Theodorson, 1979:455). In this respect, we can say that beliefs shape values since beliefs dictate what is valuable and set forth the criteria based on which a judgment should be established.

We can see this when we look at the emergence of religions and ideologies—values and value judgments of a society change when it adopts a new religion or ideology. Or, when a person becomes a member of a group, they embrace and internalize the value system created according to the fundamental beliefs of that group. Similarly, social values are shaped by the dominant beliefs of that society. In other words, as beliefs change, values change in parallel with beliefs since beliefs determine what is valuable.

That is to say, although the value is often used instead of belief, it is not a belief but a concept shaped by belief.

¹ Gulag: Labor camp

3. BELIEF

Unlike all these concepts, belief is a set of unstructured, unrestricted acknowledgments that are not bound by any rules or laws, whether scientific, social, or formal. As stated by Ok (2007:7), “...*the phenomenon of belief is not a phenomenon that is only specific to organized religions. It is a human-related phenomenon.*”

There may be people who are members of the same religion but have different beliefs on many issues. In contrast, people from different religions, even atheists, can have the same beliefs on many issues. In other words, belief is subject-based and does not have systematic integrity, rule, or qualification. Beliefs can be considered in the context of religion, ideology or values advocated, but this does not mean that belief is based on religion or ideology. They shape people’s beliefs only to a certain extent, but beliefs are influenced by many factors, including religion and ideology as well as the society people live in, the family they grow up in, their group of friends, their education, and their living standards.

At this point, it is helpful to divide the concept of belief into at least three parts:

Basic/Core (Distinctive) Beliefs: These are the beliefs shared by the formal or informal organization the individual belongs to, which differentiate that organization (and hence the individual) from other organizations (and individuals). In other words, they are the beliefs that people use to describe themselves or the organization they belong to. Every ideology, religion, view, cult, movement that brings people together and makes them a group, in short, everything has its basic/core beliefs. The concept of basic/core belief here is different from the one described by psychology.

Basic belief also has several layers. A person who introduces himself/herself as a socialist versus other beliefs can further elaborate this belief among socialists and position himself/herself as a Marxist, Leninist, or Maoist, and in more detail, she/he can specify a fraction. Again, someone who says that he is a Muslim versus other beliefs can differentiate himself/herself from other people and groups by stating his sect among Muslims and his congregation (if any) among people of the same sect.

Subjective Beliefs: These are beliefs that are unique to the person. Some of these beliefs may contradict the basic beliefs. For instance, someone who believes that only God knows the unseen can also believe in fortune-telling. But it does not matter whether or not other people believe it.

General Beliefs: These are the beliefs of society in general. They are independent of and even above religion, ideology, and similar affiliations.

There is a continuous transition between these beliefs. A person’s subjective belief can turn into a basic belief when the person gains dominance in the organization. For example, when a person who believes that he is the Mahdi gains a dominant position in his organization, he can make those around him have the same belief, and it can turn into a basic belief. In this case, those who think that he is not a Mahdi cannot survive in the organization and leave. The basic belief of the organization changes in line with the beliefs of the one who is in the dominant position.

This does not only happen in religious belief-based organizations. Similar cases may occur in companies, political parties, states, NGOs, and in short, all types of organizations. It is often impossible for top or middle-level managers who do not share the same belief with their manager or leader (and in this context, missions and corporate values are also beliefs) to stay in the organization. The beliefs of the top manager or leader often become basic beliefs for that organization. Or, when the advocates of a subjective belief reach a certain size, that subjective belief becomes the basic belief.

There may be hostility towards certain belief groups in some organizations, whether or not they are religious. They may not want these belief groups that they oppose to, to be customers or members of their organizations. The organizations that refuse to provide services to certain groups may even be NGOs or governmental organizations. In other words, the state may refuse to provide services to its citizens solely because of their beliefs (which do not have to be religious beliefs) or even deprive them of the most fundamental citizenship rights.

The Communist Control Act of 1954, which banned the Communist Party in the USA, or the law passed in 2021 in French Senate which outlaws the headscarf for minors in public, or apartheid states that made laws to force different racial groups to live separately and develop separately are some examples of attitudes towards certain religious or ideological beliefs or racial groups.

There are some other cases where even the European Court for Human Rights's (ECHR) decision is based on beliefs, not facts. Below two cases show how ECHR's decisions are influenced by the beliefs of decision-makers (ECHR, 2018).

Case 1: Lautsi and Others v. Italy

18 March 2011 (Grand Chamber) The applicant's children attended a state school where all the classrooms had a crucifix on the wall, which she considered contrary to the principle of secularism by which she wished to bring up her children. During a meeting of the school's governors, the applicant's husband raised the question of the presence of religious symbols in the classrooms, particularly mentioning crucifixes, and asked whether they ought to be removed. Following a decision of the school's governors to keep religious symbols in classrooms, the applicant brought administrative proceedings and complained in particular, without success, of an infringement of the principle of secularism. She complained before the Court that the display of the crucifix in the State school attended by her children was in breach of Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion) of the European Convention on Human Rights and of Article 2 (right to education) of Protocol No. 1 to the Convention.

Decision: In its Grand Chamber judgment, the European Court of Human Rights held that there had been no violation of Article 2 (right to education) of Protocol No. 1 to the European Convention on Human Rights, and that no separate issue arose under Article 9 (freedom of thought, conscience and religion) of the Convention. It found in particular that the question of religious symbols in classrooms was, in principle, a matter falling within the margin of appreciation of the State – particularly as there was no European consensus as regards that question – provided that decisions in that area did not lead to a form of indoctrination. The fact that crucifixes in State-school classrooms in Italy conferred on the country's majority religion predominant visibility in the school environment was not in itself sufficient to denote a process of indoctrination. Moreover, the presence of crucifixes was not associated with compulsory teaching about Christianity; and there was nothing to suggest that the authorities were intolerant of pupils who believed in other religions, were non-believers or who held non-religious philosophical convictions. Lastly, the applicant had retained her right as a parent to enlighten and advise her children and to guide them on a path in line with her own philosophical convictions.

Case 2: Dahlab v. Switzerland

15 February 2001 (decision on the admissibility) The applicant, a primary-school teacher who had converted to Islam, complained of the school authorities' decision to prohibit her from wearing a headscarf while teaching, eventually upheld by the Federal Court in 1997. She had previously worn a headscarf in school for a few years without causing any obvious disturbance.

Decision: The Court declared the application inadmissible (manifestly ill-founded), holding that the measure had not been unreasonable, having regard in particular to the fact that the children for whom the applicant was responsible as a representative of the State were aged between four and eight, an age at which children were more easily influenced than older pupils.

In Case 1, having crucifixes in state-school classrooms does not lead to indoctrination, but as in Case 2, a headscarf teacher does.

In Turkey, years followed the coup of 1980, academicians were expelled from universities with the law numbered 1402 solely because of their beliefs. Students were classified as "leftist," "rightist," or "religious" only based on their appearance, mustache, beard, or head covers and deprived of their education rights because *they did not share the official belief*.

And this is not only limited to formal organizations. An example is that, in the street dominated by a congregation or religious group, neighborly relations may not be established with a family that does not belong to that congregation or order and does not share the same basic religious beliefs, even if they are the members of the same religion, and even their places of worship may be separated so that they do not go to a place of worship that does not belong to their religious order unless they have to.

Terrorist organizations that murder people under the guise of religion just because they do not have the same beliefs as them (which are not even religious beliefs since no religion approves of the murder of an innocent person) illustrate the extremities of a harsh belief climate. Congregations that penetrate governmental organizations have caused much more significant damage than those terrorist organizations by preventing

anyone outside their belief system from holding certain positions and making the largest and most vital organization in a state dysfunctional. This has been again done under the guise of religion, although no religion approves of assigning duties to people if it is not done through merit. These, which replace religion, reflect the beliefs of those who have established or rule the organization.

4. ORGANIZATIONAL BELIEF CLIMATE

There is no definition of organizational belief climate in literature. Most definitions presented are of workplace spirituality or Organizational Spiritual Climate, and the rest are anything but not organizational belief climate. Furthermore, there is no consensus on those definitions either (Kolodinsky et al., 2008). Definitions differ depending on the researcher's perspective formed by his/her culture and religion.

Some of those definitions are

- ✓ *a spiritual and unworldly work climate* (Pandey et al., 2009 and 2016),
- ✓ *a climate that leads people towards spirituality* (Paredes-Collins, 2014),
- ✓ *a match between personal spiritual values and values of belief, and the spiritual values of the organization* (Kolodinsky et al., 2008),
- ✓ *an ethical climate of an organization* (Parboteeah and Cullen's, 2003), and
- ✓ *a match between one's personal beliefs and the organization's beliefs and spiritual values* (Caplan and Harrison, 1993).

The main complexity here is that concepts such as organizational belief and workplace spirituality have been confused with the concept of organizational belief climate, and the difference between them is not emphasized. Although they seem to be close to each other, they are, in fact, very different concepts, as shown under the previous headings. Organizational belief emphasizes a belief shared by all members of the organization, ingrained in all of the organization's activities and culture, while organizational belief climate is about the freedom of belief provided by the organization to its members and the assurance of this freedom by considering the differences, if any, as the richness and using them for the benefit of the organization. This difference is the most important detail that distinguishes our definition of the organizational belief climate from others.

In this regard, *organizational belief climate* is about how tolerantly an organization, even if it is based on religious belief, approaches its members and their beliefs, regardless of the nature and level of their beliefs, and to what extent it allows its members to speak up and to live according to their beliefs, and how much it accepts its members as who they are. In short, organizational belief climate is not about what the members of the organization believe in, but how members' beliefs are being treated.

There are three different conditions in the organizational belief climate:

- ✓ Harsh
- ✓ Moderate and
- ✓ Warm

The decisions made by the ECHR (2018) on *Lautsi and Others v. Italy* and *Dahlab v. Switzerland* are good examples of harsh belief climate because of the double standards followed. An organization with a **harsh belief climate** does not allow its members to have symbols of their beliefs or express themselves within the organization's boundaries, as in *Dahlab v. Switzerland* case. The European Union itself is based on the Judeo-Christian value system (Netherlands Scientific Council for Government Policy, Zürcher and Van der Linden, 2004), i.e., values shaped by Judeo-Christian belief, and therefore a Catholic nun may wear a headscarf but a Muslim woman may not (Catholic San Francisco, 2019). Sometimes, the law that prohibits other belief groups may be used against their own (DW, n/a; Catholic San Francisco, 2019), and this situation causes disturbance within the society. This situation may be extended for all religious symbols. For example, *the majority of primary and secondary schools in Belgium, including state, community, and confessional (mostly Catholic) schools, does not allow (non-Catholic) religious symbols for teachers* (Open Society Justice Initiative, 2018:22).

The measures taken by some organizations that adopted this attitude are not be limited to their members. Such organizations refuse to do business or interact with customers other than those who share their beliefs

(Younger, 2015). Baker, who refused to make a cake for a gay wedding in Lakewood, Colorado, USA (Edelman, 2018), is one of the many examples of this situation.

The same is true for informal groups who share the same world view, the taste of music, or believe in the same philosophy of life. It is very difficult for people who do not share the same basic beliefs to join these groups or stay there even if they do.

Media organizations are fulfilling a special duty with shaping the public perception regarding the beliefs of certain groups. For example, a person who attacked people in Church in Nice, France, with a knife called Islamist Extremist or Terrorist (The Guardian, 2020a), but the person who killed 51 people in the mosque located in Christchurch, New Zealand, with semi-automatic weapons is called just gunman (The Guardian, 2020b). The motivation of both of them was the same, so if one called an Islamist terrorist, then the other should be called a Christian terrorist. This tendency is affected by the organizational belief climate of those media organizations.

Organizations with a **moderate organizational belief climate** do not oppose the self-expression of their members if it does not conflict too much with the dominant belief of the organization. They approach the dominant belief in the organization with tolerance as much as possible, allowing people who share such beliefs to fulfill the requirements of their beliefs. Those whose belief is not the dominant belief in the organization can survive as long as they do not disrupt their work, do not criticize, and their words and actions do not contradict and conflict with the dominant belief. There is an umbrella of protection at the mercy of the manager instead of organizational or systematic protection. Such organizations allow people to work even if they are not members of that belief group, but a glass ceiling prevents them from holding decision-making positions. There are officials in the Turkish Armed Forces who were prevented from being promoted or forced to retire, or even left to die because their mother or wife was wearing a headscarf or performing daily prayers (Can Saka and Altınöz, 2011) can be considered in both this context and **harsh belief climate** as well.

Organizations with a **warm organizational belief climate**, on the other hand, allow their members to express themselves. At the same time, they emphasize that other members have the same rights, and they observe and protect the rights of each member of the organization.

In the real world, there is no organization with a **warm organizational belief climate**. All organizations develop some reflexes to protect themselves. And unwritten rules always exist in many places. Even organizations that claim to be tolerant of other beliefs, ideas, or lifestyles fail to show that tolerance to people with different ideas, from different ethnicities, cultures, religions, or gender preferences.

Table 1. Organizational Belief Climates

Harsh Organizational Belief Climate	Warm Organizational Belief Climate
Organizational Characteristics	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Autocratic Leadership Style • Closed Organizational Structure • Stable • Unable to Learn • High Hierarchical Centralization • Ideology-Based HR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participative Leadership Style • Organic Organizational Structure • Dynamic • Able to Learning • Decentralization • Merit-Based HR
<i>In Terms of States</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Totalitarian Regimes • People Exist for the State • Emphasis on Ideology • Its Existence Depends on the Existence of an Enemy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Democratic Regimes • State Exists for the People • Emphasis on Knowledge • Its Existence Depends on Itself

The organizational belief climate is a continuous variable between the two extremes, and it can often be noticed when people with different beliefs interact with or join the organization. It is almost impossible for the members of the organization to notice the odds since the practices will appear usual, as they should be.

4.1. The Importance of Belief and the Organizational Belief Climate

People’s beliefs and the work they do give essential clues about their personalities. Although this has led to more studies on belief and work life in recent years, they were mostly limited to religious beliefs. These studies

investigated how religious feelings and thoughts of employees affect their work and work-related behaviors (Duffy, Reid, & Dik, 2010).

Employees' beliefs have a high impact on their career planning and person-organization fit (Duffy & Blustein, 2004), and a job is not only a means to earn money and sustain their lives, but also a space to express themselves, so their work means much more for the employees (Bloch, 2004 and 2005). Similarly, the peace of mind about employees' spiritual and religious emotions has a positive impact on their job satisfaction (Robert et al., 2006). It becomes more important, especially during the periods of crisis and positively impacts employees' physical and mental health, increases their endurance and abilities to cope with stress (Adams et al., 2000; Ellison & Smith, 1991; Graham et al., 2001; Kanya, 2000).

Today, the intense human mobility has transformed organizations into places where people of very different beliefs and ethnic origins work together. Due to this mobility, employees have to work outside of their own cultures, religions, beliefs, and geographies, which has led them to seek support and understanding from their organizations for their beliefs and values that make their lives meaningful also at workplaces. This pursuit of meaning and support has made the organizations a resource for employees to get the support they need (Cash & Gray, 2000).

Considering that the organizational goals are achieved very effectively by matching these goals with the goals of the employees, ensuring employees' ownership of the organization, and establishing the person-organization fit, it is apparent how important the organizational belief climate is for the organizations. With people having many different beliefs starting to work together, the organizations need to develop an approach to review their human resources policies, to protect all beliefs, and to respect each employee's belief (Gerdeman, 2018).

4.2. Variables Affected by the Organizational Belief Climate

The organizational belief climate is mostly affected by the belief typology of the founder, leader, and top management team. The dominant culture, religion, and social values also affect the organizational belief climate to some extent. There are, however, several organizational variables that are affected by organizational belief climate. Some of those variables that we think are positively affected by the organizational belief climate include:

- ✓ Motivation
- ✓ Organizational Citizenship Behavior
- ✓ Organizational Commitment
- ✓ Person-Organization Fit
- ✓ Psychological Ownership
- ✓ Job Satisfaction
- ✓ Task Performance
- ✓ Extra-Role Behavior

And some variables that we think are negatively affected by the organizational belief climate include:

- ✓ Intention to Quit the Job
- ✓ Exhaustion Syndrome
- ✓ Work stress
- ✓ Negative Behaviors

This list does not mean that the organizational belief climate does not affect other organizational variables. On the contrary, it affects many variables, including the sector in which the organization is running the business, its strategy, structure, and operating style.

5. CONCLUSION

Organizations are social entities, and their belief is one of the most critical factors that determine the interactions of these social entities with their members and their environment and the interactions among their members. To this end, the organization's attitude towards the members' beliefs and other beliefs determines the type, intensity, and direction of these interactions.

This study aimed to explain the concept of organizational belief climate, which has been incorrectly defined in the literature, and give some information about its typology and how it should be understood.

Compared to the ethnic, racial, and other differences of organizations' human resources, there are very few studies on differences in belief and how organizations manage these differences (King et al., 2009). In recent years, migration to Western countries, especially to Europe, has increased due to political instability, civil wars, and occupations in the Middle East and African countries (Kaypak & Bimay, 2016). As a result, people with different beliefs started to work together in almost every organization, more than in any other period in history (Cash & Gary, 2000). Considering that there are differences on the basis of belief even among people of the same religion, this diversity in the beliefs of organizations' human resources is much higher than expected.

At the academic level, the subject of spirituality and religious beliefs in workplaces is a fairly new topic, and it is necessary to increase the number of academic studies and to examine their relationship with other variables (Benefiel et al., 2014; King et al., 2009). However, no studies in the literature have taken the belief apart from religion or spirituality, and therefore, the confusion between the organizational belief climate and workplace spirituality emerges. In this respect, this study is important in emphasizing this deficiency, drawing attention to it, and creating a starting point.

This conceptual framework indeed will have some shortcomings, errors, and limitations because there is no similar study in the literature, and in general, belief is only perceived from a religious point of view, whereas the organizational climate of belief has a completely different definition. However, it can be considered to be important for being a starting point for similar studies and forming a basis for future studies.

REFERENCES

- Adams, T. B., Bezner, J. R., Drabbs, M. E., Zambarano, R. J. ve Steinhardt, M. A. (2000). Conceptualization and measurement of the spiritual and psychological dimensions of wellness in a college population. *Journal of American College Health*, 48. 165–180.
- Bebek, A. (1994). *Ceza*. TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi, İstanbul: TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi.
- Benefiel, M., Fry, L. W. ve Geigle, D., (2014). Spirituality and religion in the workplace: History, theory, and research, *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 6(3). 175-187.
- Bloch, D. P. (2004). Spirituality, complexity, and career counseling. *Professional School Counseling*, 7, 343–350.
- Bloch, D. P. (2005). Complexity, chaos, and nonlinear dynamics: A new perspective on career development theory. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 53, 194–207.
- Boztilki, M. ve Ardıç, E., (2017). Maneviyat ve Sağlık. *Journal of Academic Research in Nursing. Jaren* , 3, 39-45.
- Can Saka, Y. ve Altınöz, G. B. (2011). *Dünü Bugünü Yarınıyla Başörtüsü Meselesi*. Ankara: ARGE Analiz.
- Caplan, R. D. ve Harrison, R. V. (1993). Person-Environment Fit Theory: Some History, Recent Developments, and Future Directions, *Journal of Social Issues*, 49. 253–276.
- Carroll, T. (2013). Addressing religion and spirituality in the workplace. K. I. Pargament, A. Mahoney, & E. P. Shafranske (Editörler), *APA handbooks in psychology, APA handbook of psychology, religion, and spirituality (Vol. 2): An applied psychology of religion and spirituality*. (s. 595–612): APA.
- Cash, K. C. ve Gray, G. R. (2000). A framework for accommodating religion and spirituality in the workplace. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 14(3). 124-134.
- Catholic San Francisco (2019). Elderly French nun receives apology for ban on habit in retirement home. Retrieved from <https://catholic-sf.org/news/elderly-french-nun-receives-apology-for-ban-on-habit-in-retirement-home>
- Çarkoğlu, A. ve Toprak, B. (2006). *Değişen Türkiye'de Din, Toplum ve Siyaset*. İstanbul: TESEV Yayınları.
- D'encasse, H. C. (2019). *Dünyayı Değiştiren Altı Yıl* (Çev. Şehsuvar Aktaş). İstanbul: Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Duffy, D. D. ve Blustein, D. L. (2005). The relationship between spirituality, religiousness, and career adaptability. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 67(3), 429-440.

- Duffy, R. D., Reid, L. ve Dik, B. J. (2010). Spirituality, religion, and career development: implications for the workplace. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 7(3), 209-221.
- DW (n/a). *Headscarf Law Applies to All Religious Coverings, Judges Say*. Retrieved from <https://www.dw.com/en/headscarf-law-applies-to-all-religious-coverings-judges-say/a-3336570>.
- ECHR (2018). European Court of Human Rights Factsheet – Religious symbols and clothing. Retrieved from https://www.echr.coe.int/documents/fs_religious_symbols_eng.pdf.
- Edelman, A. (2018). Baker who refused to make cake for gay wedding: ‘I don’t discriminate’. NBC News June 5, 2018. Retrieved from <https://www.nbcnews.com/politics/politics-news/baker-who-refused-make-cake-gay-wedding-i-don-t-n880061>.
- Ellison, C. W. ve Smith, J. (1991). Toward an integrative measure of health and well-being. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 19. 35–48.
- Ergil, D. (2015). İdeoloji Üzerine Düşünceler . *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi* , 38 (1), 69-95.
- Estreicher, S. ve Gray, M. J. (2006). Religion and the U.S. Workplace. *Human Rights*, 33(3). 17-24.
- Gaufrey-Demombynes, M. (1969). *Mahomet*. Paris: Édition Albin Michel
- Gerdeman, D. (2018). Religion in the Workplace: What Managers Need to Know. *Harvard Business Review*, Eylül 2018.
- Graham, S., F., Flowers, C., Burke, M. T. (2001). Religion and spirituality in coping with stress. *Counseling and Values*, 46, 2–13.
- Gürbüz, A. (2018). *İdeoloji ve İdeolojik Kişilik Kritiği*. Retrieved from <http://www.bingol.edu.tr/documents/İdeoloji ve İdeolojik Kişilik Kritiği Güncel Hukuk için Kısaltılmış Hali.pdf>.
- Hoyt, S. F. (1912). The Etymology of Religion. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 32(2), 126-129
- Hull, J. M. (1999). Spirituality, religion, faith: Mapping the territory. *Youth And Policy*, 65, 48-59.
- Kamya, H. A. (2000). Hardiness and spiritual well-being among social work students: Implications for social work education. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 36. 231–241.
- Kaypak, Ş. ve Bimay, M. (2016). Suriye Savaşı Nedeniyle Yaşanan Göçün Ekonomik v.e Sosyo-Kültürel Etkileri: Batman Örneği, *Batman Üniversitesi Yaşam Bilimleri Dergisi*, 6(1). 84-110
- King, J. E. Jr., Bell, M. P., Lawrence, E. (2009). Religion as an aspect of workplace diversity: an examination of the US context and a call for international research. *Journal of Management, Spirituality & Religion*, 6(1). 43-57.
- Kolodinsky, R. W., Giacalone, R. W., Jurkiewicz, C. L. (2008). Workplace Values and Outcomes: Exploring Personal, Organizational, and Interactive Workplace Spirituality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 81. 465–480.
- Netherlands Scientific Council for Government Policy, Zürcher, E., & Van der Linden, H. (2004). *The European Union, Turkey and Islam*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press. Retrieved August 8, 2021, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt46n05v>
- Ok, Ü. (2007). *İnanç psikolojisi: hayatı anlamlandırma biçiminin yaşam boyu gelişimi*. Ankara: Ankara Okulu.
- Open Society Justice Initiative (2018). *Restrictions on Muslim women’s dress in the 28 EU Member States: Current law, recent legal developments, and the state of play*. Briefing Paper, Open Society Foundation. Retrieved August 8, 2021, from <https://www.justiceinitiative.org/uploads/dffdb416-5d63-4001-911b-d3f46e159acc/restrictions-on-muslim-womens-dress-in-28-eu-member-states-20180709.pdf>.
- Pandey, A., Gupta, R. K. ve Arora, A. P. (2009). Spiritual Climate of Business Organizations and Its Impact on Customers’ Experience. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88. 313–332.
- Pandey, A., Gupta, R. K. ve Kumar, P. (2016). Spiritual Climate and Its Impact on Learning in Teams in Business Organizations. *Global Business Review*, 17(3S). 159S–172S.

- Parboteeah, K. B. ve Cullen, J. B. (2003). Ethical Climates and Spirituality: An Exploratory Examination of Theoretical Links. R. A. Giacalone ve C. L. Jurkiewicz (Editörler). *Handbook of Workplace Spirituality and Organizational Performance*. (s. 137–151). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe Publishers.
- Paredes-Collins, K. (2014). Campus Climate for Diversity as a Predictor of Spiritual Development at Christian Colleges. *Religion & Education*, 41. 171–193.
- Robert, T. E., Young, J. S., Kelly, V. A. (2006). Relationships Between Adult Workers' Spiritual Well-Being and Job Satisfaction: A Preliminary Study. *Counseling and Values*, 50. 165-175.
- Sinanoglu, M. (1994). *İman*. TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi, İstanbul: TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi.
- The Guardian (2020a). Attacks in France put Islamist extremism back in spotlight. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/oct/29/attacks-in-france-put-islamist-extremism-back-in-spotlight>.
- The Guardian (2020b). Christchurch gunman pleads guilty to New Zealand mosque attacks that killed 51. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/mar/26/christchurch-shooting-brenton-tarrant-pleads-guilty-to-new-zealand-mosque-attacks-that-killed-51>.
- Theodorson, G. A. ve Theodorson, A. G. (1979). *A Modern dictionary of sociology*. New York: Barnes & Noble Books. Retrieved from <https://archive.org/details/moderndictionary00theorich>.
- Tümer, G. (1994). *Din*. TDV İslam Ansiklopedisi, İstanbul: TDV İslâm Araştırmaları Merkezi.
- Younger, B. (2015). *Why aren't more Christians refusing service?* Baptist News Global, October 2, 2015. Retrieved from <https://baptistnews.com/article/why-aren-t-more-christians-refusing-service/>.